

**Remarks/Arguments**

**35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,240 B1), in view of Haraoka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,898,801 B1), hereinafter referred to as “Haraoka”.

It is respectfully asserted that neither Goddard nor Haraoka, alone or in combination, disclose the step of:

“responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating for another rating sample from said rating sample database of said television signal receiver system, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample, wherein the contents stored in said rating sample database were selected for storage without user input and stored without user intervention, and wherein said rating sample database contents are distinct from user-recorded content,”

as described in currently amended claim 1.

In Goddard, “a method of setting acceptable content rating parameters for filtering content in a ratings-enabled media wherein the acceptable content rating parameters delimit the threshold content ratings levels of content that may be accessed by an information appliance is provided. Employing the present method, a user may set the acceptable content rating parameters of a content control system by blocking or unblocking example content provided by the information appliance, in order to control future access to content similar to the example content. In this manner, specific knowledge of the content ratings scheme employed, or the meaning of specific content ratings used by such a scheme is not required.” (Goddard Abstract)

Goddard does not disclose the use of a rating sample database in the receiver system. Goddard states: “Exemplary ratings enabled media may include, but are not limited

to, broadcast television, cable television services, pay-per-view services, video on demand services, digital satellite television services, DVD, video cassette, laserdisc, radio, cable music services, compact discs (CD), audio cassette tape, the Internet, intranets, and the like.” (Goddard, column 3, lines 61-67) None of these represent a database that is part of a television signal receiver system, particularly a database where the contents were selected for storage without user input and stored without user intervention, and wherein said rating sample database contents are distinct from user-recorded content. Thus, the “example content” of Goddard is television programs being currently received based on user selection, as opposed to the rating samples from a rating sample database in the television signal receiver system as described in the present application. (See col. 2 lines 33-36) Goddard makes no mention of storing any rating samples.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner’s assertion that the channel selection interface of Goddard, shown in Figure 1, represents a step of “presenting a user interface providing an option to display another rating sample,” as described in claim 1. Nonetheless, the claims have been amended to clarify that the user interface of the relevant step of the present claims relates to the display of another rating sample from the database. It is respectfully asserted that the channel-change buttons of Goddard cannot be interpreted as a query as to whether the user wishes to evaluate an additional sample from the ratings database of the receiver.

Thus, Goddard fails to disclose “responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating for another rating sample from said rating sample database of said television signal receiver system, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample, wherein the contents stored in said rating sample database were selected for storage without user input and stored without user intervention, and wherein said rating sample database contents are distinct from user-recorded content,” as described in claim 1. Furthermore, Goddard would fail to provide the significant advantage of the present invention of allowing a control system to be set up via pre-stored rating samples without the need to wait for desirable and undesirable content to be broadcast.

Haraoka teaches “in order to reduce the amount of data to be transmitted by a transmission apparatus, the transmission apparatus transmits control sub-information to a receiving apparatus separately from video data which is actually distributed, and eliminates redundant distribution of video data. The receiving apparatus stores the received video data and creates content in accordance with the control sub-information.” (Haraoka Abstract)

Like Goddard, Haraoka does not describe an iterative training process wherein the user is presented with an option, after assessment of a rating sample, as to whether the user wishes to evaluate an additional sample. Haraoka also fails to describe the storage of specific television rating samples in a database of a receiving system or the detection of user input regarding the acceptability of a sample accessed from that database. Therefore, Haraoka, like Goddard, fails to disclose “responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating for another rating sample from said rating sample database of said television signal receiver system, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample, wherein the contents stored in said rating sample database were selected for storage without user input and stored without user intervention, and wherein said rating sample database contents are distinct from user-recorded content,” as described in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Goddard or Haraoka, that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that independent claims 7 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18, are dependent from allowable independent claims, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
James A. Strothman et al.

/Brian J. Cromarty/

---

By: Brian J. Cromarty  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 64018  
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

August 23, 2010